

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Paratte et al. '346. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection, and applicants traverse for the following reasons.

Paratte et al. is directed to an interrogation system which can be used, for example, at an entrance site for ski lift systems. The device is effective for exchanging transmissions between an interrogator provided near an entrance area of the ski lift system, and a responder having an antenna, a memory and a transponder which is used by a passenger for the ski lift system. While the responder is similar in appearance to a wristwatch, it is not a watch.

In contrast, the present claims are now directed to a watch. Accordingly, the cited reference is not in an analogous art, and should not form the basis of a rejection for that reason alone.

Moreover, there are additional patentable differences between the cited reference and the invention of amended claim 1. The location of the antenna in the present invention is not disclosed or suggested in the cited reference. In amended claim 1, the antenna is disposed within the outer case, and is surrounded by the outer case, caseback and watch dial such that the antenna overlaps with the watch dial in a planar manner. An example of this configuration is shown on the following page. The antenna is identified by reference number 32.

seen in Fig. 9 below.

Metallic materials are used for the entire case in Paratte. The background of the invention in the cited reference teaches away from the use of nonmetallic materials in the case. In contrast, the crystal in amended claim 1 is made of a nonmetallic material. In any event, the cited reference does not disclose, or suggest, the location of the antenna of amended claim 1 in a watch having a watch dial made of a nonmetallic material.

The examiner has pointed out that in Paratte, a metallic exterior part is used, but it is apparent that in Paratte, only a side wall member, i.e., an outer case of the object is made of a ring like member made of metal. Most of the case back member is made of plastic material. Therefore, applicants submit that all of the exterior part of Paratte is not made of metallic material.

In Paratte, a plastic container 24 is coupled into the metallic ring like side surface 6 (the outer case of the present invention) so that part of the plastic container 24 forms a case back portion of the exterior part of the object and also forms an inner side wall of the metallic ring like side surface 6. Accordingly, it is apparent that a crystal 28, a cover 44, a control system including a stem 32 and a battery are contained inside the container 24.

Comparing this with the present invention, the present invention does not use such a container independent from the exterior part of a watch. Further, in Paratte, on a part of the outer case, such as the metallic ring like side surface 6, a slit portion 94 having a width less than 2mm, is provided so as to make it easy for the antenna provided inside the container to receive a radio wave generated from the interrogation device. However, this kind of

configuration would probably cause deterioration of the water proof characteristic and the dust proof characteristic of the watch.

In Paratte, the crystal 28 and the container 24 are connected to each other so as to close the container 24. A roof 60 is used so as to conceal the fact that the container is made of plastic material. Also, Paratte discloses a configuration of the antenna 80 in which a conductive wire is wound along an upper portion and an outer peripheral portion of the container 24 several times to form a coil like configuration.

This configuration, including the location of the antenna 80 of Paratte, is completely different from that of the present invention. The antenna 80 of Paratte simply does not adopt the technical feature of the present invention in which the antenna is provided inside an area surrounded by an outer case, a case back and a watch dial. Thus, the configuration of the antenna and its arrangement in the present invention are completely different from those of the Paratte.

In Paratte, the slit 94 is provided on a part of the metallic side surface of the object, and a metallic bezel 22 is also provided on a peripheral portion of the crystal 28. Apparently, the metallic bezel 22 prevents deterioration of the receiving characteristic of the antenna 80. Therefore, in Paratte, since a watch dial 14 does not contribute to deterioration of the receiving characteristic of the antenna 80, Paratte does not refer to any restriction about a material used for the watch dial 14.

However, since the present invention adopts the technical feature in which the antenna is provided inside an area surrounded by an outer case, a case back and a watch dial,

the material of the watch dial of the present invention should be limited to non-metallic material. Otherwise, an improvement on the receiving characteristic of the antenna cannot be expected in the present invention.

The Paratte fails to show or suggest this technical configuration of the present invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 5 is apparently also rejected under §102 on the basis of Paratte et al. '346. Claim 5 now defines a watch, and recites, among other things, that a portion of the metal exterior parts has one electrical resistance value, and another portion of the parts has a different electrical resistance value. This feature is not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference, and the reference is not directed to watches. Withdrawal is requested.

Independent claim 33 is apparently rejected under §102 on the basis of Paratte et al. '346. Claim 33 now defines a watch, and recites, among other things, an antenna having a straight or curved magnetic core. The cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) such a core in an antenna for an analogous electronic watch. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under §103 on the basis of Paratte et al. '346. Claims 18 and 19 have been amended to include the features of the amended claim 1, and are allowable for the reasons given with respect to claim 1.

Moreover, this aspect of the present invention, in which adjustment of the peeling force and the loosening torque change the receiving characteristic of an antenna which is arranged inside the metallic exterior of a watch, was first discovered by the

inventors of the present invention through various kinds of experiments. Applicants submit that it would be difficult and non-obvious to persons skilled in the art to make this discovery by applying conventional loosening torque or peeling force as used for waterproof watches to Paratte.

The rejected dependent claims are allowable for the reasons given for their respective independent claims, and for the additional features they recite. For example, the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the inserted member or gap of claim 39, with the antenna core forming a fan shaped region. Withdrawal of the rejected dependent claims is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

April 2, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978